Yee & Associates, P.C.

4100 Alpha Road
Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75244

Main No. (972) 385-8777
Facsimile (972) 385-7766

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Commissioner for Patents for **Examiner Piotr Poltorak** **Group Art Unit 2134**	Facsimile No.: **571/273-8300**
From: Stephanie Fay Legal Assistant to Betty Formby	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: **31**

Message:

Enclosed herewith:

- Transmittal Document;
- Appeal Brief; and
- Amendment to Accompany Appeal Brief.

Re: Application No. **09/895,978**
Attorney Docket No: **AUS920010373US1**

Date: Monday, October 31, 2005

Please contact us at (972) 385-8777 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.

This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION BY FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO 972-385-7766.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Ault et al.** § Group Art Unit: **2134**
§
Serial No.: **09/895,978** § Examiner: **Poltorak, Piotr**
§
Filed: **June 29, 2001** § Attorney Docket No.: **AUS920010373US1**
§

For: **User Registry Adapter Framework**

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on October 31, 2005.

By: Stephanie Fay
Stephanie Fay

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:
ENCLOSED HEREWITH:

- Appeal Brief (37 C.F.R. 41.37); and
- Amendment to Accompany Appeal Brief.

A fee of $500.00 is required for filing an Appeal Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account 09-0447. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,
Betty Formby
Betty Formby
Registration No. 36,536
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS
Duke W. Yee
Registration No. 34,285
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 385-8777

Docket No. AUS920010373US1 ***PATENT***

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Ault et al.** §
§ Group Art Unit: **2134**
Serial No. **09/895,978** §
§ Examiner: **Poltorak, Piotr**
Filed: **June 29, 2001** §
§
For: **User Registry Adapter Framework** §
§

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<u>Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)</u>
I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on October 31, 2005.

By: ____________________
Stephanie Fay

APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on September 7, 2005.

The fees required under § 41.20(B)(2), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-40

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: None
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
3. Claims pending: 1-40
4. Claims allowed: None
5. Claims rejected: 1-40
6. Claims objected to: None

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-40

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The amendment filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief in order to remove issues from the appeal has not yet been entered.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A. CLAIM 1 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 1 is directed to a method for accessing a user registry (defined as a database used in authenticating users on page 4, lines 5-9) in a system having multiple user registries associated with various servers and applications. The method is shown in Figure 6 and discussed on page 22, line 2 through page 23, line 2. The method contains the following steps:

receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry (shown as step 600, discussed on page 22, lines 4-7); and

responsive to receiving the registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the given user registry (shown as step 602, discussed on page 22, line 7 – page 23, line 1).

B. CLAIM 10 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 10 is directed to a method for accessing a user registry. It differs from claim 1 only in that it specifically recites receiving the registry-independent instruction in a registry adapter. Two registry adapters are shown in Figure 5 as 506 and 508.

C. CLAIM 20 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 20 is directed to a computer program product that contains instructions corresponding to the method of claim 1. The computer program product is discussed on page25, line 20 through 26, line 8.

D. CLAIM 29 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 29 is directed to a computer program product that contains instructions corresponding to the method of claim 10.

E. CLAIM 39 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 39 is directed to a data processing system that contains instructions corresponding to the method of claim 1. An exemplary data processing system is shown in Figure 3, discussed on page 10, line 23 through page 12, line 30.

F. CLAIM 40 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 40 is directed to a data processing system that contains instructions corresponding to the method of claim 10. An exemplary data processing system is shown in Figure 3, discussed on page 10, line 23 through page 12, line 30.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claims 1, 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40)

Claims 1, 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as obvious over Hadfield *et al.*, Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook, Que Corporation, 1997 (hereinafter "**Hadfield**").

B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-28 and 30-38)

Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-28 and 30-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over **Hadfield** and Murray *et al.*, Windows Programming: An Introduction (Covers Version 3.0), Osborne McGraw-Hill, 1990 (hereinafter "**Murray**").

ARGUMENT

A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claims 1, 10, 20, 29, 39 and 40)

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Regarding exemplary claim 1, the rejection states:

> As per claims 1 Hadfield et al. teach Windows NT architecture that is divided into a user mode and kernel mode layers (Fig. 3.1, pg. 64). In the kernel mode layer Hadfield et al. show executive components such as the Security Reference Monitor that governs all access, creation, and deletion of objects with the system (Fig. 3.1, pg. 64-65 and 68). Hadfield et al. teach that the log-on process is at the user mode layer (Fig. 3.1, pg. 64). Even though log-on process involves registry access (e.g. pg. 166), being at the user mode layer the log-on process does not have direct access to registries but rather it must utilize executive services to accomplish the task (e.g. Fig. 3.6 pg. 78 and Fig. 3.4 pg. 76).
>
> The above reads on issuing a registry-independent instruction to a registry adapter (executive services) to perform an operation on the user registry, and responsive to the registry adapter's executing registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry, receiving a result of the operation.[1]

Hadfield does not anticipate the claimed invention because this reference does not show the recited step of "*in a system containing a plurality of user registries, receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries*". There are at least two ways in which **Hadfield** does not meet the features of this claim: (a) **Hadfield** does not show a system containing a <u>plurality</u> of registries, nor would one of

[1] Office Action of 06/09/2005, page 3, item 2

ordinary skill in the art interpret the reference in this manner; and (b) **Hadfield** does not show receiving a registry-independent instruction. Both of these assertions will be discussed in greater detail.

Hadfield does not have a plurality of registries

In **Hadfield**, the undersigned was able to find only one paragraph that refers to a registry, i.e., page 166, which notes:

> You can view the format of a SID number by opening the Windows NT Registry editor. When a user logs on to a Windows NT Server or Workstation, a user profile is created for the account. This profile contains desktop information and settings specific to the individual and is stored in the form of a *hive file* on the system. The registry contains the locations of these hive files and lists them by the individual account's SID number. ...

Notably, this paragraph refers only to "the registry" in Windows NT, with no reference to the presence of multiple registries, as recited in Claim 1. Neither does the office action provide any suggestion that **Hadfield** has more than a single registry. Thus, there is no suggestion in the written record that **Hadfield** includes multiple registries.

It is noted that after the final rejection, a telephone interview was held with the Examiner. During the interview, Applicants made the assertion that the reference does not show a "*system containing a plurality of user registries*". In response, the Examiner asserted that according to Webster's Dictionary, an entry in a registry can be considered a registry. It is noted, in reply, that there are several problems with this interpretation.

First, Merriam Webster's online dictionary contains the following definitions of a registry:

```
1 : registration, enrollment
2 : the nationality of a ship according to its entry in a
register: flag
3 : a place of registration
4 a : an official record book b : an entry in a registry
```

It is noted that the last two entries appear to be closely related, since they are listed as two parts of a single entry. Thus, it is asserted that if the recited registry is taken to be an entry in a registry, then according to this definition, the multiple registries should be interpreted as entries in a record book or at least entries in the type of record that would, at one time, have been kept in a book. However, **Hadfield** does not appear to be a registry in the sense that is defined in the dictionary. Instead, **Hadfield** presents the Windows Registry as a database used by the operating system in a computer, a meaning that is specific to the computer environment. Webopedia (i.e., www.webopedia.com), which advertises itself as the number one online encyclopedia dedicated to computer technology, provides a technical definition of a registry in computer technology thus:

> A database used by the Windows operating system (Windows 95 and NT) to store configuration information. The Registry consists of the following major sections:
>
> - HKEY_Classes_Root - file associations and OLE information
> - HKEY_Current_User - all preferences set for current user
> - HKEY_User - all the current user information for each user of the system
> - HKEY_Local_Machine - settings for hardware, operating system, and installed applications
> - HKEY_Current_Configuration - settings for the display and printers
> - HKEY_Dyn_Data - performance data
>
> Most Windows applications write data to the Registry, at least during installation. You can edit the Registry directly by using the Registry Editor (*regedit.exe*) provided with the operating system. However, you must take great care because errors in the Registry could disable your computer.

It is asserted that the rejection's mixture of a technical definition (i.e., Hadfield) and a non-technical definition (Webster's Dictionary) of a registry in this manner is both improper and a misuse of the language. The Examiner is free, of course, to use either the technical definition or the non-technical definition, but the use must be consistent throughout the rejection; it is not proper to mix the two definitions indiscriminately. **Hadfield** does not show a registry in the meaning of the dictionary definition and so the combination of this interpretation with this reference is not valid. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art of computer technology would not define a registry as an <u>entry</u> in the Windows Registry. Rather, they would view **Hadfield** as containing only the single Windows Registry. Therefore, this feature of claim 1 is not met.

It should be noted at this point that Applicants, acting as their own lexicographer, have defined a *user registry* in a broader sense than just the Windows Registry, having defined user registries in the application as "*the databases that store data for use in authenticating users*"[2]. This means that the Windows Registry can be viewed as a user registry, but it is only a single user registry.

[2] Application, page 4, lines 8-9

Hadfield does not have registry-independent instructions

As discussed above, **Hadfield** has only one registry, the Windows NT Registry. Given the single registry, all instructions that are aimed at accessing the single registry are registry specific or registry dependent, i.e., they have been written specifically for this single registry. Given that there is only one registry, this feature is not met.

Further, even if one accepts the Examiner's assertion that **Hadfield** shows multiple registries (i.e., entries in the Windows Registry), instructions directed to accessing these "registries" will address specific entries, so these instructions cannot be considered independent of their "registries". The rejection suggests that since the log-on process "does not have direct access to registries" the fact that the log-on process works through the executive services of Windows is the same as having registry-independent instructions. However, this interpretation appears to confuse the issue. In the invention claimed in Claim 1, instructions to a registry are changed from a generic, or registry-independent, format to a format that is registry-dependent, or more specific to their registry. However, in **Hadfield**, managing the access to the Windows Registry through the executive services does not make the instructions more specific to their "registries", whether one perceives one or multiple "registries" in **Hadfield**. Thus, whichever interpretation one takes of a registry, this feature is not met.

Thus, two features of the claims have been shown to be unmet by **Hadfield**. **Hadfield** does not have a plurality of registries; neither does **Hadfield** have registry-independent instructions. Consequently, claim 1 is allowable over **Hadfield**. It is further noted that the other claims in this group include these features and are thus also allowable.

B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-28 and 30-38)

If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Patent Office has not produced a *prima facie* case of unpatentability because the combination of **Hadfield** and **Murray** does not meet the claimed features. As discussed in the anticipation rejection of the independent claims, **Hadfield** does not meet the features recited in the independent claims. Further, **Murray** does not make up for the deficiencies of **Hadfield** with regard to the unmet features of the independent claims. All dependent claims also contain the features of their independent claims. Therefore, the combination of **Hadfield** and **Murray** does not meet the recitations of these dependent claims. These claims are allowable over **Hadfield** and **Murray**.

The Board of Appeals is requested to overturn the rejection of all claims and to indicate this application to be allowable.

Betty Formby
Reg. No. 36,536
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

1. A method for accessing a user registry, comprising:

in a system containing a plurality of user registries, receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

4. The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

5. The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

10. A method for accessing a user registry, comprising:

receiving, in a registry adapter, a registry-independent instruction designed to perform an operation on a first registry;

translating said registry-independent instruction into a registry-dependent instruction for a user registry associated with said registry adapter and forwarding to said first registry.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

12. The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

13. The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

14. The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

15. The method of claim 10, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

16. The method of claim 10, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

17. The method of claim 10, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

18. The method of claim 17, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

19. The method of claim 10, wherein the result includes a completion status code.

20. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for accessing a user registry, comprising instructions for:

in a system containing a plurality of user registries, receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

21. The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

22. The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

23. The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

24. The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

25. The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

26. The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

27. The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

28. The computer program product of claim 27, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

29. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for accessing a user registry, comprising instructions for:

receiving, in a registry adapter associated with a first registry, a registry-independent instruction designed to perform an operation on said first registry;

translating said registry-independent instruction into a registry-dependent instruction and sending said registry-dependent instruction to said first registry.

30. The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

31. The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

32. The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

33. The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

34. The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

35. The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

36. The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

37. The computer program product of claim 36, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

38. The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the result includes a completion status code.

39. A data processing system, comprising:

a bus system;

a plurality of user registries connected to said bus system;

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor;

memory; and

a set of instructions in the memory, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to perform the acts of: receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

40. A data processing system, comprising:

a bus system;

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor;

a plurality of user registries connected to said bus system;

memory; and

a set of instructions in the memory, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to perform the acts of: issuing a registry-independent instruction to a registry adapter to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to the registry adapter's sending registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry, receiving a result of the operation.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence to be presented.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Ault et al.** § Group Art Unit: **2134**

Serial No.: **09/895,978** § Examiner: **Poltorak, Piotr**

Filed **June 29, 2001** § Attorney Docket No.: **AUS920010373US1**

For: **User Registry Adapter Framework**

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on October 31, 2005.

By: Stephanie Fay
Stephanie Fay

AMENDMENT TO ACCOMPANY APPEAL BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This amendment is filed concurrently with the Appeal Brief for this application for the sole purpose of removing issues from the appeal. No fees are believed to be required. If, however, any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 9, 2005, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Listing of Claims begins on **page 2** of this paper.

Remarks begin on **page 7** of this paper.

IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (Previously presented) A method for accessing a user registry, comprising:

in a system containing a plurality of user registries, receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

4. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

5. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

8. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

10. (Previously presented) A method for accessing a user registry, comprising:

receiving, in a registry adapter, a registry-independent instruction designed to perform an operation on a first registry;

translating said registry-independent instruction into a registry-dependent instruction for a user registry associated with said registry adapter and forwarding to said first registry.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

13. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

14. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

15. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

16. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

17. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

18. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

19. (Currently amended) The method of claim 10, ~~wherein the result includes~~ further comprising instructions for receiving a completion status code.

20. (Previously presented) A computer program product in a computer readable medium for accessing a user registry, comprising instructions for:

in a system containing a plurality of user registries, receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

21. (Original) The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

22. (Original) The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

23. (Original) The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

24. (Original) The computer program product of claim 21, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

25. (Original) The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

26. (Original) The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

27. (Original) The computer program product of claim 20, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

28. (Original) The computer program product of claim 27, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

29. (Previously presented) A computer program product in a computer readable medium for accessing a user registry, comprising instructions for:

receiving, in a registry adapter associated with a first registry, a registry-independent instruction designed to perform an operation on said first registry;

translating said registry-independent instruction into a registry-dependent instruction and sending said registry-dependent instruction to said fist registry.

30. (Original) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the registry-independent instruction is a function call.

31. (Original) The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a function in a dynamically-linked library (DLL).

32. (Original) The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a function that takes a structured data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

33. (Original) The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the function call is to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

34. (Original) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation includes reading data from the user registry.

35. (Original) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation includes writing data to the user registry.

36. (Original) The computer program product of claim 29, wherein the operation is performed with respect to a data object in the registry.

37. (Original) The computer program product of claim 36, wherein the data object is one of a user object, a group object, a policy object, a resource object, a resource group object, a resource credentials object, and a list of objects.

38. (Currently amended) The computer program product of claim 29, ~~wherein the result includes~~ further comprising instructions for receiving a completion status code.

39. (Previously presented) A data processing system, comprising:

a bus system;

a plurality of user registries connected to said bus system;

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor;

memory; and

a set of instructions in the memory, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to perform the acts of: receiving a registry-independent instruction to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of registries; and

responsive to receiving said registry-independent instruction, sending registry-dependent instructions to perform said operation on said given user registry.

40. (Previously presented) A data processing system, comprising:

a bus system;

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor;

a plurality of user registries connected to said bus system;

memory; and

a set of instructions in the memory, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to perform the acts of: issuing a registry-independent instruction to a registry adapter to perform an operation on a given user registry of said plurality of user registries; and

responsive to the registry adapter's sending registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry, receiving a result of the operation.

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application. Claims 19 and 38 are sought to be amended in order to remove issues from the accompanying appeal, filed concurrently with this amendment.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for referring to "the result" in independent claim 29, since "the result" had been removed from claim 29 in the previous amendment. The Examiner is thanked for bringing this error to Applicant's attention. Claim 38 has been amended to recite the subject matter in a manner consistent with the previous claim amendments. At the time this amendment was prepared, it was noted that Claim 19 contained a similar error; this claim has also been amended to correct the reference.

Therefore the rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the amendments above to Claims 19 and 38 are to remove issues from the appeal and their entry is urged.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: October 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Formby

Betty Formby
Reg. No. 36,536
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Agent for Applicants